

Hollister Village Apartments

Addendum to Westar Village Final Environmental Impact Report Case No. 16-029

Prepared by:

City of Goleta
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, CA 93117

July 2016
Revised February 2017
(for Option A Design)

Hollister Village Apartments

Addendum to Westar Village Final Environmental Impact Report

Table of Contents

	Page
1.0 Introduction	4
1.1 Overview.....	4
1.2 Background - Westar Village Project, Case No. 08-143-GPA-RZ-OA-TM-DP	4
1.3 CEQA Authority for the Addendum Analysis	4
1.4 Scope of Addendum	5
1.5 Adoption and Availability of Addendum	6
2.0 Project Description	6
2.1 Project Location	8
2.2 Current Proposal – Hollister Village Apartments	9
3.0 CEQA Environmental Analysis	10
3.1 Introduction.....	10
3.2 Determining Significance	10
3.3 Requirements for Cumulative Impact Analysis.....	10
3.4 Consistency With Goleta’s General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan.....	11
3.5 Environmental Impact Analysis	11
3.5.1 Potential Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Project.....	11
AESTHETICS.....	12
AIR QUALITY.....	12
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.....	18
CULTURAL RESOURCES	19
GEOLOGY AND SOILS	19
GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS	20
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	28
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	29
LAND USE AND PLANNING	30
NOISE	30
POPULATION AND HOUSING.....	31
PUBLIC SERVICES	32
RECREATION.....	32
TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC	33
UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.....	35
Conclusion	36
References	36
Appendices	37

List of Tables

Table 1 – Amended Project Information.....8
Table AQ-1 - Operational Scenario Assumptions for the Original and Amended Project15
Table AQ-2 - Estimated Annual Construction Activity Emissions (tons/year) For the Original
Project and Amended Project.....17
Table AQ-3 - Daily Operational Emissions.....18
Table GHG-1 - Estimated Annual Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions for Original and
Amended Project.....23
Table GHG-2 - Estimated Annual Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions for Original and
Amended.....25
Table GHG-3 - GHG Emissions Threshold Comparison for Original Project.....28
Table GHG-4 - GHG Emissions Threshold Comparison for Amended Project..... 28
Table TT-1 – Net Trip Generation Comparison.....34
Table TT-2 – Soil Export Traffic Generation.....34

List of Figures

Figure 1 – Project Location 8
Figure 2 – Approved and Amended Project Site Plan.....10

List of Appendices

Appendix A – Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program from the 2012 Westar Village FEIR
Appendix B – Westar Final Phase Project - Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions
Assessment Memorandum (Dudek Feb 2016)
Appendix C – Westar Final Phase Project - Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions
Assessment Memorandum (Dudek July 2016)
Appendix D - Trip Generation Comparison and Evaluation of Proposed Soil Export Truck Route
for the Hollister Village Mixed-Use Project Memorandum (ATE February 2016)
Appendix E - Hollister Village – Final Phase Preliminary Drainage Memo (Stantec February
2016)
Appendix F - Westar Mixed-Use Village Project, Goleta DP Amendment – LLA Final Phase Site
Exterior Noise Assessment. (Dudek February 2016)
Appendix G – Hollister Village Mixed-Use Village Project – Evaluation of Proposed Soil Export
Truck Route (ATE September 2015)
Appendix H - Goleta Water District: Revised Water Demand Estimates Memorandum (July
2015)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 OVERVIEW

The City of Goleta ("City") has prepared this Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the Westar Village Project. The FEIR (11-EIR-001) evaluated the potential environmental effects of the Westar Village Project and was certified by the City Council in 2012. This document is prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code §§ 21000, *et seq.*) and CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, §§ 15000, *et seq.*). The Westar Village FEIR is available for review at the City Planning and Environmental Review Department.

1.2 BACKGROUND - WESTAR VILLAGE PROJECT, CASE NO. 08-143-GPA-RZ-OA-TM-DP

On October 2, 2012, the Goleta City Council approved the Westar Village Project for 266 multi-family residential apartment units, 90,054 square feet of commercial space and five live-work condominium units on a 23.55-acre site. The FEIR for the Westar Village Project addressed the associated environmental impacts and mitigation measures. Also, the Westar Village Project included an application for a General Plan Amendment (GPA) affecting the 9.849 acres on the southern portion of the project site. The GPA changed the land use designation on this portion of the site from Residential-Medium Density (R-MD) 15-20 units per acre to Community Commercial (C-C). A Zone Change was also required for this portion of the site by changing the Mobile Home Subdivision designation with an Affordable Housing Overlay (MHS/AHO DR-12.3) and Industrial Research Park (M-RP) to a Shopping Center (SC) zone designation. An addendum for the GPA was prepared to provide clarification of environmental impacts and to address minor changes associated with the GPA to the General Plan/CLUP Final Environmental Impact Report, 2006 (Westar Village FEIR). The Westar Village FEIR and GPA Addendum were certified by the City Council in October 2012 and the Westar Village Project has been developed with the exception of the 1.84-acre site.

The Applicant filed an amended project description proposing to construct 33 apartment units upon 1.84 acres located on the project site that was previously approved for commercial and live/work development.

1.3 CEQA AUTHORITY FOR THE ADDENDUM ANALYSIS

According to CEQA Guidelines § 15164, an addendum to a previously certified FEIR or Negative Declaration is the appropriate environmental document in instances when "only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in [CEQA Guidelines] Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred." CEQA Guidelines § 15162 calls for the preparation of a subsequent negative declaration if the lead agency determines that:

- (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the Project which will require major revisions of the previous negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;

- (2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the Project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
 - a. The Project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous negative declaration;
 - b. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
 - c. Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the Project, but the Project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
 - d. Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the Project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

As set forth in this Addendum, none of the conditions described above will occur in relation to the Westar Village FEIR. Therefore, an Addendum is appropriate for this Project. This document describes the currently proposed Hollister Village Apartment Project and the minor changes, the similarity in impact levels or lack of new mitigation measures to those identified in the Westar Village FEIR.

As discussed in the following sections, the impacts associated with the Project do not exceed those impacts identified in the Westar Village FEIR. As supported by the analysis below, the proposed Project would have no new significant environmental effects beyond those identified in the Westar Village FEIR. Therefore, this Addendum is the appropriate environmental document under CEQA. As discussed below, mitigation measures identified in the Westar Village FEIR would apply to the current proposal.

1.4 SCOPE OF ADDENDUM

This Addendum to the Westar Village FEIR analyzes environmental impacts and mitigation measures that may be associated with implementation of the Project Site described in detail in Section 2.0, Project Description. The scope of analysis of this Addendum addresses each of the environmental resource areas that were previously analyzed in the Westar Village FEIR, inclusive of the following:

- *Aesthetics*
- *Air Quality*
- *Biological Resources*
- *Cultural Resources*
- *Geology and Soils*
- *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*
- *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*
- *Hydrology and Water Quality*
- *Land Use and Planning*
- *Noise*
- *Population and Housing*
- *Public Services*
- *Recreation*
- *Traffic and Circulation*
- *Utilities and Service Systems*

1.5 ADOPTION AND AVAILABILITY OF ADDENDUM

This Addendum to the Westar Village FEIR will be considered by the Planning Commission and City Council as part of the Project consideration. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines § 15164(c), an Addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the FEIR. The decision-making body considers the Addendum with the FEIR before making a decision on the Project.

The Addendum will be available on the City's website for general public reference and at the following locations:

City of Goleta
Planning & Environmental Review Department
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B
Goleta, California 93117

Goleta Library
500 N. Fairview Avenue
Goleta, CA 93117

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 PROJECT LOCATION

The Project site is composed of Lots 4, 5, 6, and 10 of Tract Map 32,048 for the Westar Village Project (APNs 073-030-026, -027, -028, & -033). The site is located on Village Way north of Hollister Avenue, west of Storke Road and immediately west of South Glen Annie Road (7000 Hollister Avenue). It is in the southeast portion of the approved Westar Village Project. Access to the site is from Hollister Avenue and private drive Village Way. Figure 1 shows the Westar Village Project outlined in red and the Hollister Village Apartments Project site outlined in yellow, while Figure 2 illustrates the site plan of the existing Westar Village Project and the proposed project.

2.2 CURRENT PROPOSAL – HOLLISTER VILLAGE APARTMENTS

The Westar Village Project included a previously approved component consisting of 12,687 square feet of retail space, five live-work units, associated parking, and a 0.42-acre open space/park accessible to the general public on 1.84 acres within the overall 23.6-acre Project site. The 1.84 acres ("project site") is comprised of three lots (lots 4, 5, and 6 of Tract Map 32,048). The proposed project ("Amended Project") includes the following elements:

Entitlements: The Amended Project includes requests for the following entitlements:

1. General Plan Amendment (16-029-GPA) to change the General Plan and Land Use Element Figure 2-1, the Land Use Plan Map, from Community Commercial (C-C) back to Residential Medium Density (R-MD) for APNs 073-030-026, -027, -028, & -033;
2. Rezone (16-029-RZ) from Shopping Center (SC) to Design Residential 20 units per acre (DR-20), consistent with the proposed General Plan Amendment;
3. Lot Line Adjustment (16-029-LLA) to reflect the new building and site layout associated with the proposed residential development and park; and
4. Development Plan Amendment (16-029-DPA) for the construction of 33 residential units (apartments) and associated Setback Modification.

GPA and Rezone. The existing GP/CLUP C-C land use designation and the SC zone designation would permit a wide range of local and community-serving retail and office uses, as well as mixed residential and commercial uses. The proposed GP/CLUP R-MD and the DR-20 zone designation would permit multi-family residential development and would no longer permit commercial development. These two designation changes would result in reverting the General Plan land use and zone designations for the Project site to those that existed prior to approval of the original Westar Village Project.

Lot Line Adjustment

Lots 4, 5, 6, and 10 of Tract Map 32,048 will be adjusted to accommodate the proposed development. Adjusted Lot 10 would consist of the existing developed apartment site, while Adjusted Lots 4 and 5 would each be developed with one apartment building; Lot 6 would be developed as a 0.42-acre common area/ park site lot. Gross acreages for existing and proposed lots are identified in the table below.

**Table 1
Amended Project Information**

Lot #	Proposed Land Use	Proposed Zoning	APN	Existing Acreage	Proposed Acreage	Net Change
4	R-MD	DR-20	073-030-026	0.74	0.76	+0.02
5	R-MD	DR-20	073-030-027	0.36	0.66	+0.30
6	R-MD	DR-20	073-030-028	0.62	0.42	-0.20
10	R-MD	DR-20	073-030-032,-033	13.69	13.57	-0.12
TOTAL				15.41	15.41	0.0

Development Plan Amendment (DPAM). The existing Westar Village Development Plan permits 12,687 square feet of planned commercial use; five live-work residential units; and a 0.42-acre private open space/passive park accessible to the general public on a 1.84-acre site. The proposed change would eliminate the commercial development and live-work units planned for this area and instead provide 16 studio and 17 one-bedroom apartments along with a 0.42 private open space/passive park accessible to the general public. The proposed residential density would be 19.4 units per acre (266 + 33 units on 15.41 gross acre site). The 33 apartment units would be located in two 2-story buildings along the northern portion of the 1.84-acre site. Forty parking spaces are proposed to serve the 33 units, which include 24 attached garage spaces, 12 carport spaces and four uncovered parallel spaces. The 0.42-acre open space/passive park would be located in the southern portion of the site. Associated with the DPAM are Modification requests to allow an encroachment into the secondary front yard setback along Village Way for seven (7) covered parking spaces, a mailbox cluster, and a trash enclosure; and, to allow encroachment into the side and rear yard setback for portions of the two residential buildings and elevator towers.

Grading on the Project site would include approximately 7,800 cubic yards (CY) of cut and 300 CY of fill. Export would comprise 7,500 CY of stockpiled soil generated by grading for the construction of the existing apartments. Anticipated export hauling would occur during non-peak traffic hours over a course of 2-3 weeks.

All relevant mitigation measures and conditions of approval adopted for the Original Westar Village Project would continue to apply to the Amended Project.

Figure 1 – Project Location

Hollister Village Apartments Project Site

Project site outlined in Yellow
Westar Village Project outlined in Red



Figure 2 – Approved and Amended Project Site Plan (1.84-acre portion)



APPROVED PROJECT



PROPOSED AMENDED PROJECT

3.0 CEQA ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This Addendum addresses the Amended Project's effects related to the environmental topics and mitigation measures addressed in the Westar Village FEIR. The baseline for review is the Westar Village FEIR as approved and entitled as described in section 2.0 above. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) summary table from the Westar Village FEIR is included as Appendix A to this Addendum for reference.

3.2 DETERMINING SIGNIFICANCE

The criteria for determining the significance of environmental impacts in this Addendum are the same as those contained in the Westar Village FEIR. While the criteria for determining significant impacts are unique to each issue area, the analysis applies a uniform classification of the impacts based on the following definitions:

- A designation of ***no impact*** is given when no adverse changes in the environment are expected.
- A ***less-than-significant impact*** would cause no substantial adverse change in the environment.
- An impact that is ***less than significant with mitigation incorporated*** avoids substantial adverse impacts on the environment through mitigation.
- A ***significant and unavoidable*** impact would cause a substantial adverse effect on the environment, and no feasible mitigation measures would be available to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

Based on the above criteria, the environmental impact analysis assesses each issue area to determine the significance level. The City categorizes Project impacts as follows:

- ***Class I*** impacts are significant adverse impacts that cannot be feasibly mitigated, reduced, or avoided. During approval of the GP/CLUP, the City Council adopted a statement of overriding considerations, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15093, explaining why Project benefits outweigh the disturbance caused by these significant environmental impact or impacts.
- ***Class II*** impacts are significant adverse impacts that can be feasibly reduced or avoided through the implementation of GP/CLUP policies, or by other recommended mitigation. During approval of the GP/CLUP, the City Council made findings pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15091 that impacts have been mitigated to the maximum extent feasible by implementing the recommended mitigation measures.
- ***Class III*** impacts are adverse impacts that are less than significant. During approval of the GP/CLUP, the City Council was not required to make CEQA findings regarding these impacts.
- ***Class IV*** impacts include changes to the environment as a result of GP/CLUP implementation that would be beneficial.

3.3 REQUIREMENTS FOR CUMULATIVE IMPACT ANALYSIS

CEQA Guidelines §15130 requires a reasonable analysis of the cumulative impacts of a project.

Cumulative impacts are defined as “two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts” (CEQA Guidelines §15355).

The City’s previous adoption of the GP/CLUP involved no immediate direct physical environmental impacts. Rather, the GP/CLUP projected future development within the City, and the FEIR analysis focused on “indirect” impacts associated with the adoption of the GP/CLUP.

Because these impacts would occur over time as part of individual residential and commercial/ industrial development projects, a project horizon year (2030) was established for purposes of analysis in the Westar Village FEIR. Since an Addendum involves the assessment of only minor technical changes in the conditions assumed to exist, no change in the Westar Village FEIR-assessed cumulative impacts would occur and cumulative impact assessment is not a part of this Addendum.

3.4 CONSISTENCY WITH GOLETA’S GENERAL PLAN/COASTAL LAND USE PLAN

The proposed Addendum is a minor revision to the Westar Village FEIR that is consistent with its fundamental goals. A proposed General Plan Amendment changes the General Plan land use designation from Community Commercial (C-C) back to Medium Density Residential (R-MD).

No changes to the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan (GP/CLUP) Plan’s goals are proposed and the GPA is considered consistent with them.

3.5 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

For an Addendum to be an adequate environmental document for a Project pursuant to CEQA, the Project must involve only a minor technical change or addition. From an environmental perspective, the Lead Agency must demonstrate the following with respect to that proposed change:

- That the project will not have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR;
- That the project would not create effects that result in an increase of the severity of significant effects already identified in the previous EIR;
- That all feasible mitigation measures are accepted and adopted; and
- That no additional mitigation measures are required to reduce one or more significant effect or, if these are required, that they are imposed as part of the environmental assessment.

This Addendum is an environmental analysis for the proposed Project described in Section 2.0 Project Description.

3.5.1 Potential Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Project

This section addresses each of the environmental issues discussed in the Westar Village FEIR to determine whether or not the Amended Project has the potential to create new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the significance of a significant impact as compared to what

was identified in the Westar Village FEIR, within the framework of CEQA Guidelines § 15162 and 15164.

AESTHETICS

Section 4.1 of the Westar Village FEIR describes the aesthetics/visual resources setting relative to the Westar Village Project, impacts on aesthetics/visual resources that would result from the Westar Village Project, and mitigation measures that would reduce potentially significant impacts. The two proposed apartment buildings (containing 33 dwelling units) in the Amended Project will have building heights up to 26.5' feet; the existing approvals allow for buildings between 27' and 33' in height. The Amended Project's architecture, landscaping, lighting and fencing are designed to match the approved Westar Village Project design. Therefore, the Amended Project will not result in any new significant aesthetics/visual resources impacts, might lessen the severity of some previously anticipated aesthetic impacts given the reduced building heights, and no changes to mitigation measures are necessary.

Project-Specific Impacts: The following previously identified impacts in the Westar Village FEIR are still expected to occur:

Impacts AES 1 (Class I), AES 2 (Class III), AES 3 (Class II), AES 4 (Class III), AES 5 (Class I), AES 6 (Class III), AES 7 (Class III), AES 8 (Class III), AES 9 (Class II), AES 10 (Class III), AES 11 (Class IV)

Cumulative Impacts: Cumulative impacts on aesthetic resources remain the same.

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures related to Visual Resources; Visual Character; Impacts on Scenic Views, Public and Private Views; Light and Glare; and, Solar Access continue to be applicable to the Amended Project:

AES 1-1, 1-2, 2-1 (recommended), 3-1, 3-2, 3-3, 3-4, 3-5, 3-6, 3-7, 3-8, 3-9, 3-10, 5-1 (recommended), 9-1

Residual Impacts

With implementation of the adopted mitigation measures, most of the residual Project-specific and cumulative impacts would be reduced to less than significant (Class II) with two exceptions. The already identified Class I impacts on the existing visual character and quality from the public Local Scenic Corridor (AES 1) and impacts on mountain views from Hollister Avenue (AES 5) would remain.

AIR QUALITY

Section 4.2 of the Westar Village FEIR describes the air quality setting relative to the Westar Village Project, impacts on air quality that would result from the Westar Village Project and mitigation measures that would reduce potentially adverse but not significant impacts. The City of Goleta has adopted specific thresholds for reactive organic gases and nitrogen oxides, but not for carbon monoxide or particulate matter. See Appendix B and Appendix C, *Westar Final Phase Project Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment* (Dudek 2016a and 2016b) for details.

Construction Emissions Assumptions

Construction emissions were modeled for the previously approved Original Project and the proposed Amended Project. The Original Project evaluated in the 2012 Westar Village FEIR includes development of 90,054 square feet of retail, 274 apartments, and 5 live/work condominiums. The Amended Project includes development of 75,900 square feet of retail and 299 apartments. Emissions for the Original Project and the Amended Project were estimated to determine the difference in construction emissions. Estimated emissions were based on construction information provided by the project applicant (Westar), the previous analysis contained in the 2012 Westar Village FEIR, and the most recent version of the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2013.2.2 default values were utilized when project-specific information was not known and/or immediately available. CalEEMod Version 2013.2.2 was used to generate construction phasing for both scenarios, consistent with the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (SBCAPCD) recommendations for project-level review. The analysis contained herein is based on the following assumptions for the Original and the Amended Projects (duration of phases is approximate):

Estimated Construction Phasing for Original 2012 Westar Village FEIR Project

- Demolition - 4 Weeks
- Grading/Soil Export/Hauling – 7 weeks
- Building Construction – 74 weeks
- Paving – 4 weeks
- Application of Architectural Coatings – 4 weeks

Estimated Construction Phasing for Amended Project

- Demolition - 4 Weeks
- Grading/Soil Export (300 cubic yards [cy] export) – 7 weeks
- Grading/Soil Export & Hauling of 7,500 cy – 2.4 weeks (12 days)
- Building Construction – 74 weeks
- Paving – 4 weeks
- Application of Architectural Coatings – 4 weeks

The variety of construction equipment used for estimating the construction emissions of the Original and Amended Project is based on CalEEMod defaults and is shown in Table 1 of Appendix C, Construction Scenario Assumptions. The Original Project's analysis in the 2012 Westar Village FEIR included a different construction equipment fleet based on the now outdated modeling program, URBEMIS version 2007 9.2.4. To more accurately present the difference in construction emissions for both the Original and Amended Projects, CalEEMod Version 2013.2.2 was used for the analysis of both scenarios, which includes updated calculation equations and emission factors. For this analysis, it was assumed that heavy construction equipment will operate 5 days a week (22 days per month) during Project construction for both scenarios. Additionally, worker vehicle trips and vendor truck trips are based on CalEEMod Version 2013.2.2 default values.

The haul truck assumptions for the Final Phase (Hollister Village Apartments) portion of the Amended Project scenario were based on information provided by the applicant and Association Transportation Engineers (ATE) *Trip Generation Comparison and Evaluation of Proposed Soil Export* memorandum (ATE 2016; Appendix D). An additional 7,500 cubic yards (cy) of soil are required to be exported off-site as a result of refinements made on the Amended Project to lower the grading and building heights when compared to the Original Project. As asserted by

the applicant, it is assumed that construction for both the Original Project and the Amended Project scenarios would last approximately 11 months, with an estimated 2-3 weeks of additional construction time that would be required to haul the additional soil off-site for the Amended Project. Consequently, 12 additional days were utilized in the CalEEMod modeling assumptions for the purpose of the Amended Project analysis.

The Original Project assumes export of 300 cubic yards of excess cut material; the Amended Project assumes export of 7,800 cubic yards (300 cubic yards + 7,500 cubic yards) of excess cut material. Haul truck trips for all export activities are estimated based on the estimated export volume and the haul truck capacity provided by ATE (ATE 2016) (i.e., 9 cubic yards per truck). The 300 cubic yards of export is estimated to require 68 one-way haul truck trips (136 round truck trips). Accordingly, the additional 7,500 cubic yards of export is estimated to require an additional 1,668 one-way haul truck trips (834 round truck trips).

Operation Assumptions

The Amended Project would include development of 33 apartment units instead of the 12,687 square feet retail space and 5 live-work condominium units as analyzed in the 2012 Westar Village FEIR (Original Project) for the central-eastern portion of the Project site. Table AQ-1, Operational Scenario Assumptions for the Original Project and Amended Project, presents a summary of the Original Project and the Amended Project’s proposed land uses, as well as an identification of the net change between the Amended Project and the Original Project.

**Table AQ-1
Operational Scenario Assumptions for the Original and Amended Project**

Land Use Type	Units	Original Project	Amended Project	Net Change (Amended Project Increase)
Retail	Square Feet	90,054	75,900	-14,154
Condominiums	Dwelling Units	5	0	-5
Apartments	Dwelling Units	266 constructed (274 evaluated in EIR)	299	+33

As shown in Table AQ-1, the Amended Project would include a reduction of 14,154 square feet of retail, a reduction in 5 condominiums, and a net increase in 33 apartments compared to the Original Project.

Consistent with the 2012 Westar Village FEIR analysis, existing land use trips were subtracted from the total trips generated by the Original Project and the Amended Project. Non-mobile sources of operational emissions (i.e., area, energy, water/wastewater, and solid waste) generated by the existing land use (Television Studio/ATM), however, were not estimated or subtracted from the project emissions. Accordingly, the net change in emissions between the existing land use and the project—for both the Original Project and Amended Project scenarios are slightly overestimated because the total baseline emissions were not accounted for in the emissions analysis.

Project-generated trip estimates used in this analysis were calculated based on the land use and trip generation rates identified in the *Trip Generation Comparison and Evaluation of Proposed Soil Export* memorandum (ATE 2016), which provided trip rates for the Amended Project and the 2012 Westar Village FEIR Original Project. The 2012 Westar Village FEIR air quality and GHG emissions modeling used trip generation factors for mid-rise apartments,

condominium/townhouse, and regional shopping center based on the project's *Traffic, Circulation, and Parking Study*, which was prepared for the original project by ATE in September 2010. The trip generation rates used in the 2012 Westar Village FEIR are the same as the rates used in the *Trip Generation Comparison and Evaluation of Proposed Soil Export* memorandum (ATE 2016).

Construction Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions Analysis

Construction of either the Amended Project or the Original Project would result in a temporary addition of pollutants to the local airshed. Construction emissions can vary substantially from day to day, depending on the level of activity, the specific type of operation, and, for dust, the prevailing weather conditions. Therefore, such emission levels can only be approximately estimated with a corresponding uncertainty in precise ambient air quality impacts.

Criteria air pollutant emissions associated with construction activity were quantified using CalEEMod Version 2013.2.2. A detailed depiction of the construction schedule—including information regarding phasing, equipment used during each phase, haul trucks, vendor trucks, and worker vehicles—is included in Section 2.1, Construction Assumptions, of Appendix C.

Implementation of the project is anticipated to generate construction-related criteria air pollutant emissions from soil disturbance (fugitive dust), equipment and vehicle exhaust emissions (combustion pollutants), and architectural coatings. Entrained dust results from the exposure of earth surfaces to wind from the direct disturbance and movement of soil, resulting in PM10 and PM2.5 emissions. To account for dust-control measures in the calculations, it was assumed that the project site would be watered at least three times daily, resulting in an approximately 61% reduction which would represent compliance with SBCAPCD standard dust control measures. Because the SBCAPCD is currently in nonattainment for the state PM10 standard, standard dust control measures are required for all discretionary construction activities (regardless of the significance of the fugitive dust impacts), based on policies in the 1979 Air Quality Attainment Plan (SBCAPCD 2015a). Exhaust from internal combustion engines used by construction equipment, haul trucks (dump trucks), vendor trucks (delivery trucks), and worker vehicles would result in emissions of ROC, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM10, and PM2.5. The application of architectural coatings, such as exterior/interior paint and other finishes, would also produce ROC emissions; however, the contractor is required to procure architectural coatings from a supplier in compliance with the requirements of SBCAPCD Rule 323 (Architectural Coatings).

Table AQ-2, Estimated Annual Construction Emissions for the Original Project and Amended Project, shows the estimated tons per year of construction emissions associated with the buildout of the Original and the Amended Projects. To determine the estimated emissions associated with buildout of the Hollister Village Apartments, both the Original and the Amended Projects were modeled using the latest version of the program CalEEMod (Version 2013.2.2), as the analysis from the 2012 Westar Village FEIR relied upon the now outdated program URBEMIS. Modeling both the Original and the Amended Projects with CalEEMod allowed for a proper comparison of the Amended Project's construction emissions with those of the Original Project. For informational purposes, emissions identified in the original 2012 Westar Village FEIR are also provided in Table AQ-2.

Table AQ-2
Estimated Annual Construction Activity Emissions (tons/year)
For the Original Project and Amended Project

	<u>ROC</u> (tons/year)	<u>NO_x</u> (tons/year)	<u>CO</u> (tons/year)	<u>SO_x</u> (tons/year)	<u>PM₁₀</u> (tons/year)	<u>PM_{2.5}</u> (tons/year)
2012 Westar Village FEIR URBEMIS 2007 9.2.4 (outdated) Estimated Emissions						
Original Project	7.56	8.05	11.47	0.00	8.20	2.07
CalEEMod Version 2013.2.2 Estimated Emissions						
Original Project	4.15	8.69	9.51	0.01	1.02	0.62
Amended Project	4.30	9.65	10.20	0.01	1.10	0.66
Net Annual Project Emissions (Amended Project from Additional Soil Export Increase)	0.15	0.96	0.69	0.00	0.08	0.04
SBCAPCD Threshold	25	25	-	-	-	-
Threshold Exceeded?	No	No	-	-	-	-

As shown in Table AQ-2, the marginal increase in annual construction emissions will not create any new impacts beyond those already analyzed for the Original Project in the 2012 Westar Village FEIR. Total emissions from the Original Project and the Amended Project would remain below the SBCAPCD thresholds of significance for ROC and NO_x. While the Amended Project would result in a slight increase in estimated annual construction emissions and criteria pollutants in comparison to the Original Project as a result of the additional 7,500 cy of soil export in the Amended Project, the minor increase would not represent a substantial increase in overall project-generated construction emissions and would not alter the impact significance conclusions of the 2012 Westar Village FEIR. Therefore, the Amended Project's air quality impacts associated with construction emissions would remain less than significant.

Operational Emissions

As noted in Table AQ-3 below, operational emissions would decrease slightly as a result of a decrease of 350 average daily trips (ADTs) from the elimination of the commercial uses in the Original Project compared to the proposed Amended Project with only residential uses (a 6.7% decrease below the 5,235 ADTs analyzed in the original 2012 Westar Village FEIR). Temporary construction activity emissions would occur during buildout of the 33 apartments in the Amended Project. Such emissions include onsite generation of dust and equipment from grading and construction activities, and off-site emissions from trucks delivering building materials or exporting cut soils.

**Table AQ-3
Daily Operational Emissions**

	ROC (lbs/day)	NO_x (lbs/day)	CO (lbs/day)	SO_x (lbs/day)	PM₁₀ (lbs/day)	PM_{2.5} (lbs/day)
<i>Original 2012 Westar Village FEIR Project (CalEEMod Version 2013.2.2 Estimated Emissions)</i>						
Area Source Emissions ^a	13.07	0.81	23.51	0.00	0.17	0.17
<i>Vehicular (Mobile) Source Emissions</i>	18.22	32.73	168.74	0.23	17.67	4.95
Combined Total Emissions	31.29	33.54	192.25	0.24	17.84	5.12
<i>Vehicular (Mobile) Source Emissions Per Day Threshold</i>	25	25	—	—	N/A	—
Threshold Exceeded?	No	Yes			N/A	
<i>Area + Vehicle Source Emissions Per Day Threshold</i>	240	240			80	
Area + Vehicle Source Emissions Threshold Exceeded?	No	No			No	
<i>Amended Project (CalEEMod Version 2013.2.2 Estimated Emissions)</i>						
Area Source Emissions ^a	13.39	0.98	25.23	0.00	0.20	0.20
<i>Vehicular (Mobile) Source Emissions</i>	17.13	31.25	160.09	0.22	17.00	4.76
Combined Total Emissions	30.52	32.23	185.32	0.22	17.20	4.96
<i>Vehicular (Mobile) Source Emissions Threshold</i>	25	25	—	—	N/A	—
Threshold Exceeded?	No	Yes			N/A	
<i>Area + Vehicle Source Emissions Threshold</i>	240	240			80	
Area + Vehicle Source Emissions Threshold Exceeded?	No	No			No	
<i>Net Project Emissions (CalEEMod Version 2013.2.2 Estimated Emissions)</i>						
Net Change in Total Emissions for Amended Project	-0.77	-1.31	-6.93	-0.02	-0.64	-0.16

ROC = reactive organic compounds; NO_x = oxides of nitrogen; CO = carbon monoxide; SO_x = sulfur oxides; PM10 = coarse particulate matter; PM2.5 = fine particulate matter; lbs/day = pounds per day.

^a Emissions associated with natural gas usage (energy source emissions) are included in the Area Source Emissions consistent with the SBCAPCD heating and cooling (natural gas usage) in the air quality impact analysis (SBCAPCD 2015a)

As shown in Table AQ-3, the previously evaluated Original Project in the 2012 Westar Village FEIR was determined to exceed the SBCAPCD vehicle source thresholds for ozone precursor pollutants (NO_x) during operation of the proposed Original Project, which was found to result in a significant impact with mitigation (Class II impact). The Amended Project would decrease the retail/commercial component of the Original Project; therefore, there is an overall reduction of vehicular traffic to the project site. As such, the decrease in the mixed-use component of the Original Project would also result in an associated decrease in ROC, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM10, and PM2.5 emissions. Although an additional 2-3 weeks of 7,500 cy of soil exporting would occur under the Amended Project that may increase temporary emissions, the overall reduction in traffic from removal of the mixed-use (retail component) under the Original Project would cause a decrease in the total daily operational emissions for the Amended Project. However, even with a slight decrease in operational ROC and NO_x vehicular source emissions, the Amended Project would still result in the exceedance of the SBCAPCD vehicular source emissions threshold of 25 pounds per day for NO_x.

While the Amended Project would result in an overall decrease in air quality impacts associated with operational emissions for pollutants with the adopted SBCAPCD significance thresholds,

the Amended Project air quality impacts would remain potentially significant but mitigable. The Amended Project will still be subject to all mitigation measures for air quality and transportation identified in the 2012 Westar Village FEIR, such as dust control, energy conservation, transportation system improvements and transportation demand management, and permitting requirements of the SBCAPCD. The Amended Project would not result in a substantial change in operational emissions than the 2012 Westar Village FEIR and would not alter the existing impact conclusions of the 2012 Westar Village FEIR. Therefore, no new impacts would occur under the Amended Project and no changes to mitigation measures identified in the 2012 Westar Village FEIR are necessary.

Project-Specific Impacts: The following previously identified impacts in the Westar Village FEIR are still expected to occur:

Impacts AQ-1 (Class II), AQ-2 (Class I), AQ-3 (Class II), AQ-4 (Class II), and AQ-5 (Class III)

Cumulative Impacts: Cumulative impacts on air quality remain the same. The Project's cumulative contribution to mobile source air quality impacts (ROx) would be considered significant contributions to cumulative air quality impacts.

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures related to Construction, Operational Mobile and Area Source Emissions, Operational Impacts – Health Risk from Exposure to Toxic Air Contaminants Generated by Mobile and Stationary Sources, and Operational Impacts – Air Quality Issues Associated with Proximity of Commercial and Residential continue to be applicable to the Amended Project: AQ 1-1, 1-2, 1-3, 1-4, 1-5, 2-1, 3-1, 3-2 (recommended), and 4-1.

Residual Impacts

Under the above mitigation measures, residual Project-specific and cumulative impacts would be reduced to less than significant with the exception of Impact AQ 2 (operational mobile source emissions) which would remain a significant unavoidable Class I impact.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Section 4.3 of the Westar Village FEIR describes the biological setting relative to the Westar Village Project, impacts on biological resources that would result from the Westar Village Project, and includes mitigation measures that would reduce potentially significant impacts to Class II and III. The proposed Project does not include any elements that would affect biological resources in a new or different manner. Therefore, no new impacts will occur and no changes to mitigation measures are necessary.

Project-Specific Impacts: The following previously identified impacts in the Final EIR are still expected to occur:

Impacts BIO 1 (Class III), BIO 2 (Class II), BIO 3 (Class II), BIO 4 (Class II), BIO 5 (Class II), BIO 6 (Class III), BIO 7 (Class II), BIO 8 (Class II), BIO 9 (Class II), BIO 10 (Class II), and BIO 11 (Class III)

Cumulative Impacts: Cumulative impacts on biological resources remain the same.

Mitigation Measures: The following mitigation measures are still required:

BIO 1-1 (Recommended), BIO 2-1, BIO 4-1, BIO 5.1, and BIO 7-1

Residual Impacts: With the above mitigation measures, the Project's impact on biological resources (Impacts BIO 2, BIO 3, BIO 4, BIO 5 and BIO 7), on a Project level and as contributions to cumulative impacts, would be reduced to less than significant, (Class II).

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Section 4.4 of the Westar Village FEIR describes the archaeological setting relative to the Westar Village Project, impacts on archaeological resources that would result from the Westar Village Project, and includes mitigation measures that would reduce potentially significant impacts. The proposed Project does not include any elements that would affect archaeological resources in a new or different manner. Therefore, no new impacts are expected to occur and no changes to mitigation measures are necessary.

Project-Specific Impacts: The following previously identified impacts in the FEIR are still expected to occur:

Impacts CR 1 (Class II), CR 2 (Class II), CR 3 (Class III), CR 4 (Class II), and CR 5 (Class II)

Cumulative Impacts: Cumulative impacts on archaeological resources remain the same.

Mitigation Measures: The following mitigation measures are still required:

CR 1-1, 1-2, 1-3, 2-1, 2-2, 2-3, 2-4, 2-5, 2-6

Residual Impacts: With implementation of the above mitigation measures, residual Project-specific and cumulative impacts related to archaeological and historic resources would be reduced to less than significant level (Class II).

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Section 4.5 of the Westar Village FEIR describes the geologic setting relative to the Westar Village Project, impacts on geologic resources that would result from the Westar Village Project, and mitigation measures that would reduce potentially significant impacts. The proposed Project does not include any elements that would affect geologic resources in a new or different manner. Therefore, no new impacts are expected to occur and no changes to mitigation measures are necessary.

Project-Specific Impacts: The following previously identified impacts in the FEIR are still expected to occur:

Impacts GEO 1 (Class III), GEO 2 (Class III), GEO 3 (Class III), GEO 4 (Class III), GEO 5 (Class III), GEO 6 (Class III), and GEO 7 (Class III).

Cumulative Impacts: Cumulative impacts on geology and soils remain the same.

Mitigation Measures: The following mitigation measures are still required to further ensure that necessary geotechnical measures are incorporated into final plans and implemented during construction:

GEO 1-1

Residual Impacts: Implementation of the mitigation measure GEO 1-1 above would ensure residual Project-specific and cumulative impacts related to geology and soils would be to less than significant.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG) were analyzed under Section 4.6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions in the 2012 Westar Village FEIR. This section evaluates the Original and Amended Project's GHG emissions separately. See Appendix B and Appendix C, *Westar Final Phase Project Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment* (Dudek 2016a and 2016b) for details.

CEQA Guidelines

With respect to GHG emissions, CEQA Guidelines § 15064.4(a) provides that lead agencies should “make a good faith effort, to the extent possible on scientific and factual data, to describe, calculate or estimate” GHG emissions. The CEQA Guidelines note that an agency may identify emissions by either selecting a “model or methodology” to quantify the emissions or by relying on “qualitative analysis or other performance based standards” (CEQA Guidelines § 15000, *et seq.*). CEQA Guidelines § 15064.4(b) provides that the lead agency should consider the following when assessing the significance of impacts from GHG emissions on the environment:

1. The extent a Project may increase or reduce GHG emissions as compared to the existing environmental setting.
2. Whether the Project emissions exceed a threshold of significance that the lead agency determines applies to the Project.
3. The extent to which the Project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of GHG emissions (CEQ Guidelines § 15064.4(b)).

In addition, CEQA Guidelines § 15064.7(c) states that “[w]hen adopting thresholds of significance, a lead agency may consider thresholds of significance previously adopted or recommended by other public agencies, or recommended by experts, provided the decision of the lead agency to adopt such thresholds is supported by substantial evidence.” Similarly, the revisions to Appendix G, Environmental Checklist Form, which is often used as a basis for lead agencies’ selection of significance thresholds, do not prescribe specific thresholds. Rather, the CEQA Guidelines establish two new CEQA thresholds related to GHGs, and these will therefore be used to discuss significance of Project impacts:

- Would the Project generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?
- Would the Project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs?

Accordingly, the CEQA Guidelines do not prescribe specific methodologies for performing an assessment, do not establish specific thresholds of significance, and do not mandate specific mitigation measures. Rather, the CEQA Guidelines emphasize the lead agency’s discretion to determine the appropriate methodologies and thresholds of significance consistent with the manner in which other impact areas are handled in CEQA.

Local Guidance

At this time, neither the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (SBCAPCD) nor the City has adopted numerical thresholds of significance for GHG emissions that would apply to

the proposed Project. The SBCAPCD recently amended its Environmental Review Guidelines (SBCAPCD 2015b) to include GHG thresholds for stationary source land uses; however, the proposed Project is not a stationary source. Stationary Sources include businesses, utilities, government agencies, and universities such as oil and gas production equipment and power plants. As such, the SBCAPCD guidance on GHG thresholds for stationary sources would not apply to the proposed Project as it involves residential development.¹ The SBCAPCD, however, recommends that all Projects subject to CEQA review be considered in the context of GHG emissions and climate change impacts, and that CEQA documents should include a quantification of GHG emissions from all Project sources, direct and indirect, as applicable (SBCAPCD 2015a). In addition, the SBCAPCD recommends that climate change impacts be mitigated to the extent reasonably possible, whether or not they are determined to be significant.

The City is currently utilizing to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) thresholds for GHG emissions as guidance for City Project-level Projects.² In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064.4(b)(2) and 15064.7(c), the City has consistently relied upon Santa Barbara County's *Support for Use of BAAQMD GHG Emissions Standards* (County of Santa Barbara 2010) as the recommended basis and threshold for establishing the GHG impacts of a Project. The BAAQMD/County of Santa Barbara Interim Thresholds of Significance for operational GHG emissions for Projects other than stationary sources is as follows, where any of these criteria can be used to evaluate a Project's GHG emissions:

- 1,100 MT CO₂E per year;
- 4.6 MT CO₂E per service population (SP) per year (SP = residents + employees); or
- Compliance with a Qualified Climate Action Plan.

The per-service population guideline is intended to avoid penalizing large projects that incorporate GHG-reduction measures such that they may have high total annual GHG emissions, but would be relatively efficient, as compared to Projects of similar scale. Consistent with the BAAQMD's *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*, the construction emissions associated with the proposed Project (e.g., those from off-road equipment, worker vehicles) will be estimated and reported; however, the GHG threshold applies only to the operational emissions. Although the BAAQMD guidance does not indicate that the short-term GHG emissions from the construction phase should be included in the emissions compared to the established threshold, it is common practice for GHG analyses performed for proposed projects in the City to amortize construction emissions over the life of the project, which is typically assumed to be 30 years, and add those emissions to the estimated annual operational emissions. However, for the purposes of this comparative analysis, construction emissions are evaluated separate from the operational emissions analysis.

The 2012 Westar Village FEIR used the BAAQMD efficiency metric threshold of 4.6 MT CO₂E per service population per year to determine the significance of potential project-generated GHG impacts under CEQA. This Addendum references the BAAQMD efficiency metric threshold of 4.6 MT CO₂E per service population per year to compare the Original and Amended Project.

¹ The SBCAPCD defines stationary source projects as "equipment, processes and operations that require an SBCAPCD permit to operate" (SBCAPCD 2015b).

² See the 2012 Westar Village FEIR regarding the case law affecting the BAAQMD's thresholds.

CalEEMod computer model outputs were used to calculate mobile source, area source, and construction GHG emissions. Operational GHG estimations are based on energy emissions from electricity usage and automobile emissions. The CalEEMod model relies upon trip data within the *Trip Generation Comparison And Evaluation of Proposed Soil Export Truck Route For The Hollister Village Mixed-Use Village Project* prepared by Associated Transportation Engineers (February 24, 2016) and Project-specific land use data to calculate emissions.

Construction GHG Emissions Analysis

As with the air quality analysis, full buildout of the Original Project and the Amended Project were evaluated to estimate the net change in GHG emissions associated with the change of the previous designated mixed-use land use to residential uses at the project site. While most of the Original Project construction has occurred, the construction analysis assumed buildout conditions to evaluate the change in GHG construction emissions associated with buildout of the Amended Project compared to buildout of the Original Project. The only portion of the project site being evaluated involves the change from mixed-use to residential uses for the Amended Project. Because the rest of the proposed Original Project construction has occurred, the construction analysis is for comparison purposes in order to evaluate how GHG construction emissions would change. Construction of the Amended Project would result in GHG emissions, which are primarily associated with use of off-road construction equipment, hauling trucks (dump trucks), vendor (material delivery) trucks, and worker vehicles. GHG emissions associated with temporary construction activity were quantified using the CalEEMod Version 2013.2.2. A detailed depiction of the construction schedule—including information regarding phasing, equipment utilized during each phase, haul trucks, vendor trucks, and worker vehicles—is included in Section 2.1, Project Construction Assumptions, of Appendix B. On-site sources of GHG emissions include off-road equipment, and off-site sources include hauling and vendor trucks and worker vehicles. Emissions from on-site and off-site sources are combined for the purposes of this analysis; a breakdown of emissions by source is provided in Appendix B.

Table GHG-1, Estimated Annual Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions for Original and Amended Project, presents a comparison between the Amended Project and the Original Project mixed-use component which was previously approved for the same location. As discussed above, the 2012 Westar Village FEIR used URBEMIS to estimate construction emissions, which is now outdated. Therefore, this analysis uses CalEEMod Version 2013.2.2 to more accurately estimate the difference in construction GHG emissions generated from the Original and Amended Project. Construction emissions for the Amended Project and the Original Project were modeled in 2017 from on-site and off-site emission sources.

Table GHG-1
Estimated Annual Construction GHG Emissions for Original and Amended Project

	MT CO ₂	MT CH ₄	MT N ₂ O	MT CO ₂ E
2012 Westar Village FEIR URBEMIS Version 2007 9.2.4 Estimated Emissions (Outdated)				
Original Project (2012 Westar Village FEIR)	-	-	-	1,364.47
CalEEMod Version 2013.2.2 Estimated Emissions				
Original Project (2012 Westar Village FEIR)	1,100.33	0.18	0.00	1,104.19
Amended Project (including additional 7,500 cubic yards [12 days] of soil export)	1,237.44	0.20	0.00	1,241.55
BAAQMD GHG Threshold of Significance	-	-	-	None for construction
Threshold Exceeded?	-	-	-	No (Class III)
Net Annual Project Emissions (Amended Project Increase)	+137.11	0.02	0.00	+137.36

Notes: See Appendix B for detailed results. MT CO₂ – metric tons carbon dioxide, MT CH₄ – metric tons methane, MT N₂O – metric tons nitrous oxide, MT CO₂E – metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent

As shown in Table GHG-1, the estimated GHG emissions generated during the construction of the Amended Project would be approximately 1,241.55 MT CO₂E in 2017. The Original Project would have resulted in approximately 1,104.47 MT CO₂E. The implementation of the Amended Project would, therefore, result in a slight increase of approximately 137.36 MT CO₂E in GHG emissions generated during construction as a result of the additional 7,500 cubic yards (CY) of soil to be exported in the Amended Project. Based on the estimated GHG emissions presented in Table GHG-1, implementation of the Amended Project would not represent a substantial change in construction emissions. Therefore, the Amended Project would not alter the conclusions of the previous 2012 Westar Village FEIR. The 2012 Westar Village FEIR concludes that the Project-related construction emissions would be temporary during construction and would not conflict with CARB's GHG emissions reduction targets under applicable law. There is also no established threshold by BAAQMD or SBCAPCD for construction emissions. Therefore, impacts are less than significant for the Original and Amended Project's construction emissions and no further mitigation measures are recommended.

Operational GHG Emissions Analysis

The use and occupancy the Original Project or the Amended Project buildout would result in GHG emissions from operational GHG sources, which include energy and electricity use, mobile sources (vehicular trips), solid waste disposal, water use, and wastewater treatment. GHG emissions associated with vehicle travel to and from the project site were estimated using CalEEMod (Version 2013.2.2) and were based on the trip generation estimates provided by Associated Transportation Engineers [ATE] (ATE 2016) for the Original and Amended Projects, and information previously evaluated in the 2012 Westar Village FEIR for the Original Project. CalEEMod default values for mobile sources were used consistent with the assumptions used in the air quality impact analysis (Section 3.2.2, Operational Emissions Analysis of Appendix B).

CalEEMod was also used to estimate emissions from the Project's area and indirect (i.e., not generated on, but associated with, the Project site) sources, which include energy use (natural gas and generation of electricity consumed by the Project); generation of electricity associated with water supply, treatment, and distribution and wastewater treatment; and solid waste disposal. Operation of gasoline-powered landscape maintenance equipment also produces minimal GHG emissions. The estimation of proposed non-mobile operational emissions was based on CalEEMod land use defaults and total area (i.e., square footage) of the proposed land use. Annual electricity emissions were estimated using the emissions factors for Southern California Edison, which would provide electricity for the Project. Default electricity and natural gas usage factors in CalEEMod were used for proposed building operation. Default factors for water supply, wastewater treatment, and solid waste were also used to estimate GHG emissions.

The estimated operational project-generated GHG emissions from area sources (landscape maintenance), energy usage, motor vehicles, solid waste generation, water supply, and wastewater treatment for the Original Project compared with operational GHG emissions of the Amended Project for 2017 (i.e., first full year of project use and operation) are shown in Table GHG-2, Estimated Annual Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions for Original Project and Amended Project. The 2012 Westar Village FEIR used the older CalEEMod version 2011.1.1 to estimate project-generated emissions, which are presented in Table GHG-2 for informational purposes. For the purpose of this analysis, the Original and the Amended Projects were modeled using the latest version of CalEEMod (Version 2013.2.2) to estimate the net emissions that would result with the change from the previously proposed mixed-uses to additional

residential uses. The latest version of CalEEMod incorporates updated mobile source emission factors and includes regulations such as Pavley and Low Carbon Fuel Standards. Additionally, the project is expected to exceed the current Title 24 standards by 25% which was applied in CalEEMod for both the Original and the Amended Projects.

Table GHG-2
Estimated Annual Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions for
Original and Amended Project

	MT CO ₂	MT CH ₄	MT N ₂ O	MT CO ₂ E
<i>Original 2012 Westar Village EIR Project (CalEEMod 2011.1.1 – Outdated Estimated Emissions)</i>				
Area Source Emissions	3.42	0.00	0.00	3.51
Energy Source Emissions	771.68	0.03	0.01	776.48
Vehicle (Mobile) Source Emissions	3,596.51	0.31	0.00	3,602.98
Solid Waste Emissions	45.24	2.67	0.00	101.40
Water Supply and Wastewater Emissions	63.73	0.03	0.02	70.54
Total	4,480.58	3.04	0.03	4,554.91
<i>Original 2012 Westar Village EIR Project (CalEEMod 2013.2.2 – Updated Estimated Emissions)</i>				
Area Source Emissions	3.39	0.00	0.00	3.46
Energy Source Emissions	694.68	0.03	0.01	697.64
Vehicle (Mobile) Source Emissions	3,255.79	0.16	0.00	3,259.23
Solid Waste Emissions	45.25	2.67	0.00	101.42
Water Supply and Wastewater Emissions	63.56	0.03	0.02	70.32
Total	4,062.67	2.89	0.03	4,132.07
<i>Amended Project (CalEEMod 2013.2.2 – Updated Estimated Emissions)</i>				
Area Source Emissions	3.63	0.00	0.00	3.70
Energy Source Emissions	669.35	0.03	0.01	672.23
Vehicle (Mobile) Source Emissions	3,127.04	0.16	0.00	3,130.33
Solid Waste Emissions	44.11	2.61	0.00	98.84
Water Supply and Wastewater Emissions	64.01	0.03	0.02	70.84
Total	3,908.14	2.83	0.03	3,975.94
<i>Net Project Emissions (CalEEMod Version 2013.2.2 – Updated Estimated Emissions)</i>				
Original Project	4,062.67	2.89	0.03	4,132.07
Amended Project	3,908.14	2.83	0.03	3,975.94
Net Change in Total Emissions (Amended Project)	-154.53	-0.06	0.00	-156.13

Notes: See Attachments A and B of Appendix B for detailed results.

MT CO₂ – metric tons carbon dioxide, MT CH₄ – metric tons methane, MT N₂O – metric tons nitrous oxide, MT CO₂E – metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent.

The Original Project evaluated in the 2012 Westar Village FEIR was estimated to result in 4,555 MT CO₂E and was determined to result in 3.9 MT CO₂E per service population per year (assuming a service population of 1,166 persons). Therefore, the Original Project was found to be below the threshold of 4.6 MT CO₂E per service population per year threshold. As shown in Table GHG-2, estimated annual Project-generated GHG emissions for the Original Project in 2017 using CalEEMod Version 2013.2.2 would be approximately 4,132 MT CO₂E per year as a result of pproject operations.

The Amended Project is estimated to generate approximately 3,976 MT CO₂E as a result of project operations. The Amended Project would, therefore, result in a decrease of GHG emissions when compared to the Original Project. Vehicles traveling to and from the proposed Project land uses would be the primary source of Project-generated GHG emissions. The Amended Project would therefore result in a decrease of GHG emissions when compared to the Original Project. While a revised service population has not been calculated for the Amended

Project due to not having a specific number of employees and residents, it can be concluded that a decrease in operational GHG emissions coupled with an increase in service population (additional apartments) would further reduce the 3.9 MT CO₂E per service population per year. Additionally, while 2013 numbers were used for consistency with the 2012 Westar Village FEIR, under the anticipated 2017 operational year scenario, which includes updated assumptions, a further decrease in estimated Project-generated emissions would occur.

The implementation of the Amended Project would result in a decrease in GHG operational emissions. Impacts would be less than significant under both the Original and Amended Project. The GHG analysis presented above would not represent a substantial change in operational emissions and therefore, would not alter the previous impact conclusions of the 2012 Westar Village FEIR. The process by which the operational emissions are deemed to be less than significant is consistent with the Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32) Scoping Plan in addition to the Project constructed in compliance with the City's Green Building Code and Energy Efficiency Standards. In 2006, the Legislature passed the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32) which created a comprehensive, multi-year program to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in California. AB 32 required the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to develop a Scoping Plan that describes the approach California will take to reduce GHG emissions to achieve the goal of reducing emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. The Scoping Plan was first approved by the Board in 2008 and must be updated every five years. Therefore, the Project's impacts to operational GHG emissions are less than significant and no further mitigation measures are recommended.

Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions Conclusions

Construction Emissions

Under the Amended Project, construction of the 33 apartment units (and related development) instead of the mixed-use development previously proposed for the project site would result in a slight increase in estimated annual construction emissions compared to the Original Project. The Original Project evaluated in the 2012 Westar Village FEIR using URBEMIS version 2007 9.2.4 concluded that the entire project would emit 7.56 tons per year of ROC and 8.05 tons per year of NO_x; which did not exceed the SBCAPCD threshold guidelines of 25 tons per year. Using CalEEMod Version 2013.2.2, emissions generated by the 2012 Westar Village FEIR Original Project were estimated to total 4.15 tons per year of ROC and 8.69 tons per year of NO_x, while emissions generated by the Amended Project were estimated to total 4.30 tons per year of ROC and 9.65 tons per year of NO_x. Although the Amended Project would result in a slight increase of construction emissions associated with the additional 7,500 cy of soil export compared to the Original Project, this minor increase would not represent a substantial change in construction emissions, and therefore, would not alter conclusions of the previous 2012 Westar Village FEIR.

Operational Emissions

Under the Amended Project, operation of the 33 apartment units instead of the mixed-use development previously proposed for the project site would result in a slight decrease in estimated maximum daily operational emissions compared to the Original Project. The Original Project evaluated in the 2012 EIR using CalEEMod Version 2011.1.1 concluded that the entire project's mobile emissions would be 28.31 pounds per day of ROC and 47.48 pounds per day of NO_x; which exceeded the SBCAPCD threshold for mobile emissions of 25 pounds per day for ROC and NO_x. Using CalEEMod Version 2013.2.2, mobile emissions generated by the Original

Project were estimated to total 18.22 pounds per day of ROC and 32.73 pounds per day of NO_x, while emissions generated by the Amended Project were estimated to total 17.13 pounds per day of ROC and 31.25 pounds per day of NO_x.

Additionally, the 2012 Westar Village FEIR concluded that combined area and mobile source emissions would be 40.11 pounds per day of ROC, 48.57 pounds per day of NO_x, and 28.25 pounds per day of PM₁₀, none of which exceeded the SBCAPCD thresholds of 240 pounds per day of ROC and NO_x or 80 pounds per day of PM₁₀. Using CalEEMod Version 2013.2.2, area and mobile emissions generated by the 2012 Westar Village FEIR Original Project were estimated to total 31.29 pounds per day of ROC, 33.54 pounds per day of NO_x, and 17.84 pounds per day of PM₁₀. Combined area and mobile emissions generated by the Amended Project were estimated to total 30.52 pounds per day of ROC, 32.23 pounds per day of NO_x, and 17.20 pounds per day of PM₁₀. Although the Amended Project would result in a decrease of criteria air pollutant emissions (ROC, NO_x, and PM₁₀), like the analysis within the original 2012 Westar Village FEIR, the Amended Project would continue to exceed the SBCAPCD mobile source threshold for NO_x emissions. As the Amended Project would result in an overall decrease in operational emissions for which significance thresholds have been adopted, this would not represent a substantial change in operational emissions, and therefore, would not alter the impact conclusions of the previous 2012 Westar Village FEIR.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Under the Amended Project, construction of the 33 apartment units instead of the mixed-use previously proposed for the project site would result in a slight increase in estimated annual construction GHG emissions compared to the Original Project. The Original Project evaluated in the 2012 Westar Village FEIR using URBEMIS version 2007 9.2.4 concluded that entire project would emit 1,364 MT CO₂E. Using CalEEMod Version 2013.2.2, construction GHG emissions generated by the 2012 Westar Village FEIR Original Project was estimated the estimated to be 1,104 MT CO₂E, while the Amended Project would emit approximately 1,242 MT CO₂E. The construction of the Amended Project would, therefore, result in a slight increase of approximately 137 MT CO₂E in GHG emissions generated during construction. The GHG analysis for the Amended Project would not represent a substantial change in constructions emissions, and therefore, would not alter the impact conclusions of the previous 2012 Westar Village FEIR.

Operational Emissions

Under the Amended Project, construction of the 33 apartment units instead of the mixed-use development previously proposed for the project site would result in a slight decrease in estimated annual operational GHG emissions compared to the Original Project. The Original Project evaluated in the 2012 Westar Village FEIR using CalEEMod version 2011.1.1 concluded that entire project would emit 4,555 MT CO₂E. Using CalEEMod version 2013.2.2, operational GHG emissions generated by the 2012 Westar Village FEIR Original Project was estimated to be 4,132 MT CO₂E while Amended Project-generated operational GHG emissions was estimated to be approximately 3,976 MT CO₂E per year, which represents a decrease of GHG emissions compared with the Original Project's operational emissions. Thus, implementation of the Amended Project would result in an overall decrease in GHG operational emissions.

The 2012 Westar Village FEIR concluded that total combined Original Project emissions of about 3.5 MT CO₂E per service population per year did not exceed the BAAQMD threshold of 4.6 MT CO₂E per service population per year threshold. A refined service population estimate

has been calculated below. Note, it can normally be assumed that a decrease in operational GHG emissions and an increase in residential units would not result in the exceedance of the BAAQMD 4.6 MT CO₂E per service population per year threshold. For purposes of this analysis for the Amended Project, service population calculations are based on the following equation(s):

Original EIR

(279 residential units x 2.7 persons/household) + (9.77 acres x 44 employees/acre) + 10 residential employees = 1,194 Service Population of Original Project

4,132 (MT CO₂E/yr) ÷ 1,194 (Service Population) = **3.5 MT CO₂E/service population/year**

Amended Project

(299 residential units x 2.7 persons/household) + (7.29 acres x 44 employees/acre) + 10 residential employees = 1,139 Service Population of Amended Project

3,976 (MT CO₂E/yr) ÷ 1,139 (Service Population) = **3.5 MT CO₂E/service population /year**

The GHG analysis presented above would not represent a substantial change in operational emissions and therefore, would not alter the impact conclusions of the previous 2012 Westar Village FEIR.

**Table GHG-3
GHG Emissions Threshold Comparison for Original Project**

Source	Total Metric Tons of CO ₂ e ²
Operational	4,132.07
Construction (amortized over 30 years)	36.806
Total Project Emissions^{2/3}	4,168.875 MT CO₂e/yr. 3.5 MT CO₂E/SP/yr.
GHG Significance Threshold	4.6 MT CO₂E/SP/yr
GHG Significance Threshold Exceeded?	No
Notes: 1. Emissions calculated using CalEEMod v.2013.2.2 computer model. 2. Totals may be slightly off due to rounding. 3. MT CO ₂ E/SP/yr = carbon dioxide equivalent per service population per year.	

Table GHG-4
GHG Emissions Threshold Comparison for Amended Project

Source	Total Metric Tons of CO ₂ e ²
Operational	3,975.94
Construction (amortized over 30 years)	41.385
Total Project Emissions^{2/3}	4,017.325 MT CO₂e/yr. 3.5 MT CO₂E/SP/yr
GHG Significance Threshold	4.6 MT CO₂E/SP/yr
GHG Significance Threshold Exceeded?	No
Notes: 1. Emissions calculated using CalEEMod v.2013.2.2 computer model. 2. Totals may be slightly off due to rounding. 3. MT CO ₂ E/SP/yr = carbon dioxide equivalent per service population per year.	

Tables GHG-3 and GHG-4 compare the Total Project-Related Sources of GHG Emissions under the Original Project and the Amended Project. As shown in Table GHG-4, the total amount of project-related “business as usual” GHG emissions from all sources combined would total 4,017.325 MT CO₂e/year. This represents a 151.55 MT CO₂e/year decrease under the Amended Project compared to the Original Project. Both scenarios would be under the suggested GHG Significance Threshold of 4.6 MT CO₂E/SP/yr. Therefore, the impact conclusions and mitigation measures established in the 2012 Westar Village FEIR would be the same under the Amended Project and would not require additional mitigation measures. Impacts to GHG emissions would remain less than significant.

Project-Specific Impacts: Impact GHG 1 (Class III)

Cumulative Impacts: Cumulative GHG emissions impacts remain the same.

Mitigation Measures: The following mitigation measures are recommended:

GHG 1-1

Residual Impacts: With implementation of the above recommended mitigation measure, GHG 1-1, GHG emissions impacts would be reduced to the extent feasible, however, based on the most current CalEEMod emissions estimation, the Project’s GHG impacts would be considered less than significant without the application of mitigations (Class III).

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Section 4.7 of the 2012 Westar Village FEIR describes the hazardous materials/risk of upset setting relative to the Westar Village Project, impacts that would result from the Westar Village Project and mitigation measures that would reduce potentially significant impacts. The proposed Project does not include any elements that would affect hazardous materials/risk of upset in a new or different manner. Therefore, no new impacts are expected to occur and no changes to mitigation measures are necessary.

Project-Specific Impacts: The following previously identified impacts in the 2012 Westar Village FEIR are still expected to occur:

Impacts HAZ 1 (Class II), HAZ 2 (Class III), HAZ 3 (Class II), HAZ 4 (Class III), HAZ 5 (Class II), HAZ 6 (Class III), and HAZ 7 (Class II).

Cumulative Impacts: Cumulative hazardous materials/risk of upset impacts remains the same.

Mitigation Measures: The following mitigation measures related to Exposure to Hazardous Materials During Construction; Exposure to Hazardous Materials Generated in the Project Vicinity; New Uses Involving the Use, Storage, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials; Exposure to Electromagnetic Fields; Proximity to a High Pressured Natural Gas Pipeline; Risk of Upset Associated with the Site's Proximity to the Union Pacific Railroad; and, Exposure to naturally Emitted Radon Gas continue to be applicable to the Amended Project:

HAZ 1-1, 1-2, 1-3, 1-4; HAZ 2-1; HAZ 3-1; HAZ 4-1 (recommended), 4-2 (recommended), HAZ 5-1, 5-2; HAZ 6-1, 6-2, HAZ 7-1

Residual Impacts: Implementation of existing regulations as well as above mitigation measures would reduce the proposed Project's residual impacts related to hazardous materials upset and exposure to less than significant (Class II).

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Section 4.8 of the 2012 Westar Village FEIR assesses impacts to surface drainage, surface water and groundwater quality, and flooding resulting from the Westar Village Project. The Westar Village Project would develop buildings, access roads, driveways, surface parking lots, landscape and hardscape areas and utilities, as well as drainage structures necessary to detain and retain surface water and to convey surface water across the Project site to point-of-concentration along or outside the project site boundaries. Hydrology, drainage, and water quality conditions that would raise environmental issues would be addressed through the standard hydrology study/review/approval process and strict compliance with applicable regulations. City wide implementation of Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Central Coast Regional Water Quality control Board (CCRWQCB) standards would be required to address potential impacts. With these requirements and mitigation measures, hydrology and water quality impacts have been reduced to levels of less than significant. See Appendix E, *Hollister Village – Final Phase Preliminary Drainage Memo* prepared by Stantec dated February 22, 2016 for the Amended Project drainage details.

The proposed Amended Project would not facilitate any new impacts related to surface water quality and therefore would not involve impacts beyond those identified in the 2012 Westar Village FEIR.

Project-Specific Impacts: The following previously identified impacts in the 2012 Westar Village FEIR are still expected to occur:

Impacts HYD 1 (Class III), WQ 1 (Class II) and WQ 2 (Class II).

Cumulative Impacts: Cumulative hydrology and water quality impacts remain the same.

Mitigation Measures: The following mitigation measures related to Hydrology and Drainage; and Surface Water and Groundwater Quality continue to be applicable to the Amended Project are still recommended:

WQ 1-1, WQ 2-1, 2-2, 2-3, 2-4

Residual Impacts

With implementation of above mitigation measure, residual impacts associated with potentially significant water quality impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels (Class II).

LAND USE AND PLANNING

Section 4.9 of the Westar Village FEIR evaluated the Project's compatibility with existing land uses in the Project area and its consistency with applicable land use policies. The Westar Village FEIR analyzed the existing land use conditions, aerial photograph interpretation, review of applicable plans and ordinances, an Airport Approach Zone Analysis.

Section 4.9 of the Westar Village FEIR also describes the land use setting relative to the Westar Village Project, land use impacts that would result from the Westar Village Project, and mitigation measures that would reduce potentially significant and potentially adverse but not significant impacts.

An addendum was prepared for a land use change from Community Commercial (C-C) to Medium Density Residential (R-MD). The Amended Project requires a change to revert back to the Medium Density Residential (R-MD) land use designation for the portion of the project site for the purpose of residential development only, which will not generate any new impacts.

The proposed Project will have reduced building footprint and building height. Accordingly, no new impacts are expected to occur and some previously anticipated impacts might be reduced in severity.

Project-Specific Impacts: The following previously identified impacts in the Westar Village EIR are still expected to occur:

Impacts LU 1 (Class II), LU 2 (Class II), LU 3 (No Impact), LU 4 (Class III), LU 5 (Class IV), LU 6 (Class II), and LU 7 (Class II)

Cumulative Impacts: Cumulative land use impacts remain the same.

Mitigation Measures:

The following mitigation measures related to Land Use Compatibility; Consistency with Zoning Ordinance; Adequacy of Parking Supply, Consistency with Santa Barbara Airport Land Use Plan; and, Consistency with the General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan continue to be applicable to the Amended Project:

LU 1 (see mitigation measures identified in Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and Noise), LU 2 (refer to mitigation measures identified in Aesthetics, Noise, and Transportation/Traffic), LU 6-1, 6-2, 6-3, LU 7-1 and Land Use Mitigation Measures from Addendum to the Westar Village FEIR dated May 27, 2011.

Residual Impacts: With implementation of above mitigation measures, residual Project-specific impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level (Class II).

NOISE

Section 4.10 of the Westar Village FEIR describes the noise setting relative to the Westar Village Project, impacts related to noise that would result from the Westar Village Project, and mitigation measures that would reduce potentially significant impacts. The proposed Amended Project does not include any elements that would affect noise in a new or different manner. Therefore, no new impacts would be expected to occur and no changes to mitigation measures

are necessary. See Appendix F (Dudek 2015c), *Westar Mixed-Use Village Project, Goleta DP Amendment – LLA Final Phase Site Exterior Noise Assessment* prepared by Dudek dated February 19, 2016 for details.

Project-Specific Impacts: The following previously identified impacts in the Final EIR are still expected to occur:

Impacts N 1 (Class II), N 2 (Class III), N 3 (Class II), N 4 (Class II), N 5 (Class II), N 6 (Class III), N 7 (Class III), and V 1 (Class III)

Cumulative Impacts: Cumulative noise impacts remain the same.

Mitigation Measures: The following mitigation measures related to Construction Noise; Operational Noise – Project Traffic Noise Generation; Commercial Operations Noise; On-Site Ambient Noise Exposure; Residential Units Outdoor Noise Exposure; Non-Commercial Common Area; and Vibration continue to be applicable to the Amended Project:

N 1-1, 1-2, 1-3, N 3-1, N 4-1, N 5-1, N 5-2

Residual Impacts: With implementation of mitigation measures described above, the Project's noise impacts would remain the same, less than significant (Class II).

POPULATION AND HOUSING

The Westar Village FEIR concluded the Original Project would not result in the potential for significant impacts related to Population and Housing, based on the analysis provided in the Initial Study/EIR Scoping Document. This section evaluates the Approved Project changes with respect to this issue.

Induce Population Growth

It was estimated that the original project, as proposed in the Westar Village FEIR, would minimally increase the Citywide population by 2.5 percent and increase the workforce by 1.1 percent. Using the City's overall average household size of 2.7 people per household,³ the original project estimated a total population increase of 754⁴ persons or 2.5 percent. The initial study also estimated that the construction of the commercial development would bring an estimated minimum total peak population (employees and customers) of 346 persons. Taken collectively, the original projects net commercial development population and residential population would be 1,102 people. The initial study concludes that this increase in the City's population was already anticipated given the fact that under the General Plan, the vast majority of the project site (22.32 acres out of - 23.55 acres) had a General Plan land use designation of was Medium Density Residential. This General Plan land use category has a designated density of 15-20 units per acre, which would result in a maximum of 1,206 persons for this site.⁵

The current Project is proposing an additional 20 units over the project analyzed in the Westar Village FEIR. Based on the City's average household size the additional units would only generate an additional population increase of 54 persons or 0.2 percent over the current population of 30,333. Therefore, even with the additional 54 persons, the estimated site population of 1,156 would remain less than the 1,206 people the City's General Plan had

³ 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-year estimates (Rental Households)

⁴ (279 units)(2.7 people per unit) = 754 people

⁵ (22.32 acres)(20 units per acre)(2.7 people per unit) = 1,206 people

estimated for 22.32 acres of the 23.55 acre site. As such, the Project's impacts related to population growth would remain less than significant.

Population and Housing Displacement

The project site is currently undeveloped. The Amended Project would not displace any existing housing units or require the displacement of any people thereby necessitating the construction of replacement housing. Therefore, no such impacts would occur.

Project-Specific Impacts: The Project's impacts to Population and Housing growth would remain less than significant.

Cumulative Impacts: The Project would still not result in any significant contribution to cumulative housing and population impacts either within the City or the surrounding Goleta Valley. The Project's contribution to cumulative population growth as well as impacts on the area's housing supply would remain less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation is required or recommended.

Residual Impacts: The Project's impacts would remain less than significant (Class III).

PUBLIC SERVICES

Section 4.11 of the Westar Village FEIR analyzed potential impacts to services of fire protection, police protection, libraries, and schools.

Additional impacts to schools, library facilities and public administration facilities arising from the additional residents of the Amended Project would be mitigated with payment in development mitigation impact fee programs for such facilities. Therefore, no new impacts would be expected to occur and no changes to mitigation measures are necessary.

Project-Specific Impacts: The following previously identified impacts in the Westar Village FEIR are still expected to occur:

Impacts PS 1 (Class II), PS 2 (Class III), PS 3 (Class III), PS 4 (Class III).

Cumulative Impacts: Cumulative public facilities impacts remain the same.

Mitigation Measures: The following mitigation measures related to Fire Protection continue to be applicable to the Amended Project:

PS 1-1, PS 1-2

Residual Impacts:

With implementation of Mitigation Measure PS 1-1 and PS 1-2, residual Project specific impacts regarding adequate fire protection services would be less than significant (Class II). All other residual impacts would remain less than significant (Class III).

RECREATION

Section 4.12 of the Westar Village FEIR analyzed the Westar Village Project's impacts on recreational facilities in the City. The Westar Village Project included construction of on-site recreational facilities which included a 0.42-acre private open space/ passive park accessible to

the general public on the subject site. The proposed Project will also include a 0.42-acre private open space/ passive park accessible to the public element and the additional impact to recreation and park facilities arising from the additional residents would be mitigated with payment in development mitigation impact fee programs for such facilities. Therefore, no new impacts would be expected to occur and no changes to mitigation measures are necessary.

Project-Specific Impacts: The following previously identified impacts in the Westar Village FEIR are still expected to occur:

Impacts REC 1 (Class III) and REC 2 (Class III).

Cumulative Impacts: Cumulative recreation impacts remain the same.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures were required in the Westar Village FEIR and therefore, no new mitigation measures would be required for the proposed Project.

Residual Impacts: The Westar Village Project's impacts were considered less than significant prior to mitigation (Class III). The proposed Project would remain the same.

TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Section 4.13 of the Westar Village FEIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts (Class I), potentially significant impacts (Class II), and less than significant impacts (Class III) related to circulation capacity within the City. Specific intersections and roadway segments were identified under each significance level. GP/CLUP Policy TE 1, Policy TE 4, Policy TE 5, and Policy TE 13 include modifications to LOS standards and transportation improvements that would reduce identified impacts. See Appendix D, *Trip Generation Comparison and Evaluation of Proposed Soil Export Memorandum* (ATE 2016) and Appendix G, *Hollister Village Mixed-Use Village Project – Evaluation of Proposed Soil Export Truck Route* (ATE 2015) for details.

Operational

The Westar Village FEIR anticipated development of an urban use at the Project site under the C-C land use designation. As described in the Project description, the proposed R-MD designation would accommodate development of similar or lower land use intensity than the existing land use designation of C-C.

Table TT-1
Net Trip Generation Comparison

Project	ADT	A.M. Peak Hour Trips	P.M. Peak Hour Trips
Certified FEIR Project	5,235	280	479
Current Proposed Project	4,885	276	452
Net Change	-350	-4	-27

The data presented in Table TT-1 above show that the current Project generates 350 less average daily trips, 4 less A.M. peak hour trips and 27 less P.M. peak hour trips when compared to the Project analyzed under the Westar Village FEIR. These calculations include consistent application of primary, diverted and pass-by factors typical for mixed use projects, as were similarly applied in the FEIR. Therefore, due to the overall reduction in traffic produced, no new operational impacts will occur and no changes to mitigation measures are necessary.

Soil Export

The Amended Project will require export of 7,500 cubic yard (CY) of soil, left over from the Approved Project, from the site to a receiver site. The material would be exported off-site over a 12 day period. Inbound trucks accessing the site would exit U.S. 101 at the Storke Road

interchange, travel south on Storke Road, make a right turn and proceed westerly on Hollister Avenue, and then turn right into the westerly site driveway. Outbound trucks would turn right from the westerly site driveway, proceed west on Hollister Avenue and access U.S. 101 at the Cathedral Oak Road Interchange.

It is estimated that a maximum of 834 trucks would arrive and depart at the project site over the haul period (ATE 2016). Based on conservative truck carrying capacity the soil export would generate an average daily traffic (ADT) volume of 140 trucks (70 per segment) for 12 days.

**Table TT-2
Soil Export Traffic Generation**

Road Segment	Existing ADT	Proposed ADT (During Export Only)	Acceptable Capacity	Exceeded?
Hollister West of Pacific Oaks	12,400	12,470	34,000	No
Hollister West of Storke Road	25,600	25,670	34,000	No

As shown in Table TT-2, the Project would add an additional 70 ADT to these two segments over the 12 day haul period. Even during the limited period the additional truck traffic would not significantly affect operations along Hollister Avenue east and west of the site based on City Impact Thresholds. Additionally, hauling hours would be limited to avoid impacts to the area intersections during the A.M. and P.M. peak commute periods. The soil export would not create any additional impacts and no changes to mitigation measures are necessary. While the truck trips would create additional wear and tear on the impacted roads, roadway wear and tear is not an analyzed CEQA issue. However, subject to the approval of the Project will be conditioned address or offset and damages to roadways.

Overall, impacts from development of the site on the circulation system capacity would be similar and the proposed project would not create additional impacts related to the circulation system beyond those identified in the Westar Village FEIR.

Project-Specific Impacts: The following previously identified impacts in the Westar Village FEIR are still expected to occur:

Impacts TR 1 (Class II), TR 2 (Class II), TR 3 (Class II), TR 4 (Class II), and TR 5 (Class III)

Cumulative Impacts: The following previously identified impacts in the Westar Village FEIR are still expected to occur:

Impacts TR-6 (Class II), TR-7 (Class II), and TR-8 (Class II)

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures related to Vehicular Site Access and Internal Circulation, Roadway Segments, Intersection Operations, and the Congestion Management Plan continue to be applicable to the Amended Project:

TR 1-1, 2-1, 3-1, 6-1, 6-2, 7-1, and 7-2

Residual Impacts

With implementation of the mitigation measures identified above, the Project’s traffic impacts would continue to be reduced to a less than significant level (Class II).

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Section 4.14 of the Westar Village FEIR addressed Project impacts on water supply, wastewater treatment, and solid waste disposal. The evaluation was based on Project estimated demand for utilities relative to the supplies and capacities of the systems and facilities that would provide service to the Westar Village Project.

Water Supply

On July 30, 2015, the Goleta Water District (GWD) issued a memorandum (Appendix H) stating that the estimated potable water demand associated with the DPAM is less than the previously purchased water allocation and historic water credit needed to serve the prior use proposed on the 1.82 acre site. Accordingly, there is sufficient water to serve the 33 apartment units.

Wastewater Treatment

The Goleta West Sanitary District (GWSD) and the Goleta Sanitary District (GSD) would provide wastewater collection and treatment, respectively, for the Project site. Impacts on wastewater collection and treatment would be relatively similar in that population and overall onsite demand would be similar to the Project. Therefore, no new impacts would be expected to occur and no changes to mitigation measures are necessary.

Solid Waste

Solid waste generation would increase by 49.05 tons/year as a result of the amended Project. With a 50% recycling the total waste sent to landfill would be 23.9 tons/year. This solid waste generation impact remains significant and unavoidable, as previously identified in the Westar Village FEIR. Solid Waste Management Plans for construction and demolition waste and ongoing operations will continue to be required as mitigation measures for the Amended Project (Mitigation Measures SW 1-1 and SW 2-1). No new mitigation measures or changes to existing mitigation measures are necessary.

Project-Specific Impacts: The following previously identified impacts in the Westar Village FEIR are still expected to occur:

Impacts WS 1 (Class II), WW 1 (Class III), SW 1 (Class II), and SW 2 (Class I)

Cumulative Impacts: Cumulative public facilities impacts remain the same.

Mitigation Measures: The following mitigation measures related to Water Demand; Wastewater Treatment; and Solid Waste continue to be applicable to the Amended Project

WS 1-1, WS 1-2, WS 1-3, WS 1-4, WW 1-1, SW 1-1, SW 2-1

Residual Impacts:

Under the remaining above mitigation measures, all other residual Project-specific impacts are less than significant, for those impacts identified as potentially significant. Residual impact associated with potentially adverse Project-specific and cumulative impacts remain adverse but not significant (Class II).

Implementation of Mitigation Measure SW 1-1 would reduce the project's construction-period solid waste impacts to a less than significant level (Class II). Although Mitigation Measure SW 2-1 would reduce the project's operational solid waste impacts, they would not reduce these impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, the project's operational solid waste impact would be significant and unavoidable (Class I).

CONCLUSION

Impacts associated with the GPA, RZ, LLA and DPAM for the Amended Project (Hollister Village Apartments) are within the parameters considered in the Westar Village FEIR. Consequently, the Amended Project would not create any new significant impacts or increase the severity of impacts previously identified in the Westar Village FEIR. As a result, no additional mitigation measures are necessary for the Amended Project. No substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances identified in the Westar Village FEIR under which the Amended Project would require major revisions. No new information of substantial importance exists that shows any of the conditions identified in CEQA Guidelines section 15162(a)(3). This addendum identifies the minor changes to the Westar Village Project and the associated Westar Village FEIR that would occur under the proposed Project. Therefore, this addendum is the appropriate environmental document under CEQA for the proposed Project.

REFERENCES

Associated Transportation Engineers (ATE)

- 2015 Hollister Village Mixed-Use Village Project – Evaluation of Proposed Soil Export Truck Route. September 29, 2015.
- 2016 Trip Generation Comparison and Evaluation of Proposed Soil Export Truck Route for the Hollister Village Mixed-Use Village Project. July 24, 2016.

City of Goleta (City)

- 2002 Environmental Thresholds and Guidelines Manual. Prepared by the County of Santa Barbara Planning and Development Department. As revised October 2002. Available online at <http://www.cityofgoleta.org/index.aspx?page=459>.
- 2006 General Plan/Coastal Land Use Plan Final EIR. SCH# 2005031151. Prepared by Jones & Storkes. September 2016. Available online at <http://www.cityofgoleta.org/city-hall/planning-and-environmental-review/general-plan/view-general-plan/general-plan-coastal-land-use-plan-final-eir>.

County of Santa Barbara (County)

- 2010 Support for Use of Bay Area Air Quality Management District Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards. Interim GHG Emissions – Evidentiary Support, County Planning and Development Department. June 10, 2010.

Dudek

- 2016a Westar Final Phase Project Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment. February 24, 2016
- 2016b Westar Final Phase Project Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment. July 1, 2016.

2016c Westar Mixed-Use Village Project, Goleta DP Amendment – LLA Final Phase Site Exterior Noise Assessment. February 19, 2016.

Envicom Corporation (Envicom)

2012 Westar Mixed-Use Village Final Environmental Impact Report. SCH# 201007106. July 2012. Available online at <http://www.cityofgoleta.org/city-hall/planning-and-environmental-review/ceqa-review/westar-mixed-use-feir>.

Goleta Water District (GWD)

2015 Revised Water Demand Estimates Memorandum. July 30, 2015.

Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (SBCAPCD)

2015a Scope and Content of Air Quality Sections in Environmental Documents. Prepared by the Technology and Environmental Assessment Division. Updated April 2015.

2015b Environmental Review Guidelines. Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended. Prepared by the Technology and Environmental Assessment Division. Adopted October 19, 1995. Last revised April 30, 2015.

Stantec

2016 Hollister Village – Final Phase Preliminary Drainage Memo. February 22, 2016.

APPENDICES

All appendices in the order they are referenced within the Addendum:

Appendix A – Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program from the 2012 Westar Village FEIR

Appendix B – Westar Final Phase Project - Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment Memorandum (Dudek February 2016)

Appendix C – Westar Final Phase Project - Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment Memorandum (Dudek July 2016)

Appendix D - Trip Generation Comparison and Evaluation of Proposed Soil Export Truck Route for the Hollister Village Mixed-Use Project Memorandum (ATE February 2016)

Appendix E - Hollister Village – Final Phase Preliminary Drainage Memo (Stantec February 2016)

Appendix F - Westar Mixed-Use Village Project, Goleta DP Amendment – LLA Final Phase Site Exterior Noise Assessment. (Dudek February 2016)

Appendix G – Hollister Village Mixed-Use Village Project – Evaluation of Proposed Soil Export Truck Route (ATE September 2015)

Appendix H - Goleta Water District: Revised Water Demand Estimates Memorandum (July 2015)